

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 24, 2008.

### **I. Summary of Allowed Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 31 and 42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The independent claims 10 and 17 were amended to include the allowable subject matter from claims 31 and 42.

### **II. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Claims 10, 17, 20-30, and 32-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,774) in view of Bodwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,951,021).

### **III. Summary of Applicants' Response**

The present Reply amends claims 10, 17, 25, and 26, and cancels claims 31 and 42, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 10, 17, 20-30, and 32-41. Claims 10 and 17 have been amended to include the allowable features previously found in claims 31 and 42. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

IV. Response to 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claim 10

The present Reply amends claim 10 to include the allowable features previously found in claim 31. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is allowable.

Claim 17

The present Reply amends claim 17 to include the allowable features previously found in claim 42. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is allowable.

Claim 25

Claim 25 (as amended) states:

A method for processing an invocation using a dynamically generated wrapper, comprising:

receiving an invocation by a wrapper object, the wrapper object instantiated from a wrapper class, the wrapper class extended from a superclass which implements a wrapper interface that includes a pre-invocation handler and a post-invocation handler, the invocation directed to a wrapped resource adapter by an application;

initiating pre-processing by the wrapper object, wherein the pre-processing code includes calling the pre-invocation handler, wherein the pre-invocation handler is configured to execute server-side code, wherein the server-side code includes transaction processing code;

calling the wrapped resource adapter by the wrapper object;

receiving a result from the wrapped resource adapter by the wrapper object;

initiating post-processing by the wrapper object, wherein post-processing including calling the post-invocation handler, wherein the post-invocation handler is configured to perform post-

processing server side tasks, wherein the post-processing server-side tasks include transaction management; and

provide the result to the application;

wherein the wrapper object is dynamically generated at runtime by a wrapper factory on an application server.

The Office Action rejected Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass in view of Bodwell.

The Office Action recognized that Glass does not disclose “the wrapper class extended from a superclass which implements a wrapper interface that includes a pre-invocation handler and a post-invocation handler ... wherein the pre-processing code includes calling the pre-invocation handler, wherein the pre-invocation handler is configured to execute server-side code, wherein the server-side code includes transaction processing code ... wherein post-processing including calling the post-invocation handler, wherein the post-invocation handler is configured to perform post-processing server side tasks, wherein the post-processing server-side tasks include transaction management...” The Office Action asserted however that Bodwell disclosed these features.

Bodwell describes a system for server-side communication support in a distributed computing environment that includes a local reference to a server object on a server. The Office Action cited col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 2; col. 7, line 61 – col. 8, line 16; col. 14, lines 25-42; col. 15, lines 49-67; col. 13, line 52 – col. 14, line 2; col. 15, lines 12-28; and col. 16, lines 1-12 for disclosing the features of claim 1.

For disclosing the feature of “wherein the wrapper object is dynamically generated at runtime by a wrapper factory on an application server,” the Office Action cited Bodwell col. 6, line 55 – col. 7, line 2. The cited portion of Bodwell describes dynamic generation of remote proxies. The cited portion of Bodwell describes parsing a java file, creating a java file for a remote proxy object, compiling, and then loading the remote proxy object. The cited portion of Bodwell does not, however, describe “wherein the wrapper object is dynamically generated at runtime by a wrapper factory on an application server.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 10 is not obvious in view of Glass and Bodwell. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection to claim 10 be withdrawn.

#### Claims 20-24, 26-30, and 32-41

Claims 20-24 and 26-30 depend from claim 10 and claims 32-41 depend from claim 17. For at least the reasons described above, claims 20-24 and 26-30 are also patentable. Claims 20-24, 26-30, and 32-41 add their own features, which render them patentable in their own right.

#### V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 31, 2008

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/  
Thomas K. Plunkett  
Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800